DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 035 105 | 24 | EA 002 773

TITLE	Use and Effectiveness of Title III in Selected "Developing Institutions". Progress Report.
INSTITUTION	Michigan Univ., Ann Arbor.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
BUREAU NO	BR-8-0431
PUB DATE	22 Oct 68
CONTRACT	OEC-0-8-080431-2999(010)
NOTE	42p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.20
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Personnel, College Faculty, College Students, *Federal Programs, Field Interviews, *Higher Education, *Program Development, Questionnaires
IDENTIFIERS	*ESEA Title III

ABSTRACT

This progress report studies the effects of programs funded under Title III in a selected group of colleges and universities. Thirty-seven developing institutions in the South and Midwest were visited and administrators, faculty, and students were interviewed. In addition, a brief opinion questionnaire was distributed to faculty members on 21 of the campuses. An abbreviated followup questionnaire is being distributed to faculty members who did not respond to the initial questionnaire. This report includes a list of the institutions visited, the interview guides, and the two questionnaire forms. Issues that seem especially relevant to the concerns of the Title III Advisory Council are presented. (MF)

BR-8-0431
PA-24
OEBR

OE Bureau of Research No. 8-0431 Contract No. 0-8-080431-2999(010)

Period: April 15, 1968, to October 15, 1968 Date of submission: October 22, 196

Name of institution: The University of Michigan

Title of project: Use and Effectiveness of Title III in Selected "Developing Institutions"

Name of project director: James L. Miller, Jr.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED035105

1. Major activities and accomplishments during this period

The project began on March 1, 1968. The period from April 15 to October 15 has been devoted primarily to data collection, organization of materials, and analysis.

From mid-April to the end of May we briefed interviewers and sent teams to talk with administrators, faculty, and students at 37 Developing Institutions in the South and Midwest. A list of the colleges visited is attached as Exhibit A. An outline of interviewer training activities and travel schedule were submitted as part of a progress report in May. Twenty-one interviewers were used in order to complete data collection before faculty and students scattered from the sample institutions at the end of the academic year; interviewers paid by the project, as well as regular staff members, are listed under #8 below. Attached to this report as Exhibit B are copies of interview guides developed to assist interviewers with data collection during their campus visits.

In the space of five weeks, a total of 219 interviewing days were spent talking with about 250 college administrators and staff members, 175 faculty members, 50 National Teaching Fellows, and 65 students or student groups. In addition, interviewers collected printed materials and factual

EA 002 773

data from each campus, and conferred with staff members in central coordinating offices and at established cooperating institutions. Detailed notes prepared by interviewers following their campus visits total more than 2400 pages of typescript.

The research design called for a brief questionnaire to sample faculty attitudes toward Title III programs. Originally we had hoped to distribute the questionnaire to faculty members and administrators on all campuses visited. However, it was necessary to omit the six institutions in the NETCHE consortium because they had completed the academic year by the time we were able to schedule visits to them, and four other colleges were omitted because visits were during final exams or after commencement. We elected to distribute questionnaires at five of the ten KCRCHE colleges in our study group. One institution failed to follow through with distribution as arranged. Therefore, in the end a brief opinion questionnaire was individually constructed to list Title III programs appropriate to each of 21 colleges in our study, and was distributed to faculty and staff during interviewer visits to these campuses. Responses were returned directly to the Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan, in prepaid envelopes.

We have received about 600 responses to the faculty questionnaire. Probably the fact that most of the questionnaires were distributed right at the end of the academic year largely accounts for the one-third response rate received so far. In mid-October an even shorter version of the questionnaire is being sent to about 1000 faculty members who received questionnaires but did not respond in the spring, in order to increase the representativeness of responses to the basic questions. Sample copies of the original questionnaire and the follow-up are attached to this report as Exhibits C and D.

Most of the summer was spent organizing the interview data, coding the faculty questionnaires, and compiling brief case reports on selected institutions and types of programs. In September and early October the research staff has met regularly to discuss details and implications of the data. Dr. Miller and Dr. Gurin traveled to Washington twice to confer with the Title III - Developing Institutions staff in the Office of Education and will return again October 21-22 to meet with the Title III Advisory Council. Final report materials on background of the study, research design, and related literature are in the process of being prepared.

Some computer analysis of data from the faculty questionnaire has just become available; integration of interview, literature, and questionnaire data is underway. A brief discussion of findings has been prepared for the Title III Advisory Council and is attached to this report as Exhibit E. A more detailed preliminary statement on data analysis and conclusions is planned as noted under #9 of this progress report.

2. Problems

We have requested adjustment of the contract dates to agree with our planned work schedule of March 1 to December 31, instead of February 16 to December 16, and understand that this extension has been granted. Generally, we have been able to stick pretty closely to our proposed work schedule. Academic calendars of subject institutions have given us some problems in data collection, notably the rush to complete campus visits before the end of the academic year in May and the need to postpone follow-up visits and questionnaires until October when the colleges were again in session.

3. Significant findings and events

See the attached preliminary report prepared for the Title III Advisory Council (Exhibit E) and comments under #1 above.

4. Dissemination activities. We have not prepared any publicity materials.

5. Capital equipment acquisitions. We have not acquired any capital equipment with Federal funds.

6. Forms. Interview guides and faculty questionnaires are attached as Exhibits B, C, and D; see comments under #1 above.

7. Other activities. None.

8. Staff summary

All staff members listed here are being paid under this project from Federal funds.

Name	Title or function	Period employed	Percent of time
Miller, Dr. James L., Jr.	Project Director	3/1-12/31	33%
Gurin, Dr. Gerald	Research Coordinator	3/1-12/31	33%
Clark, Mary Jo	Administrative Coordinator	3/1-8/31 9/1-12/31	50% 25%
Marchese, Theodore J.	Administrative Coordinator	3/1-4/30	50%
Lurie, Lynne	Secretary	3/1-12/31	100%
Gardner, Carroll	Interviewer Case-study write-up	4/24-6/6 8/17-10/15	Full-time Special project
Weems, Luther	Interviewer Case-study write-up	4/24-5/31 8/15-9/9	Full-time Special project
Betsey, Charles L.	Interviewer	4/24-5/31	*
Croake, Richard M.	Interviewer	4/24-5/31	*
Fales, Martha H.	Interviewer	4/24-5/31	*
Fincher, A. Lawrence	Interviewer	4/24-5/31	*
Fischer, Kenneth C.	Interviewer	4/24-5/31	**
Garris, John R.	Interviewer	4/24-5/31	*
Hixson, Dumont	Interviewer	4/24-5/31	*
Hodges, Joseph D.	Interviewer	4/24-5/31	*
Peters, William R.	Interviewer	4/24-5/31	*
Seyon, Patrick L. N.	Interviewer	4/24-5/31	*
Tonn, Joan C.	Interviewer	4/24-5/31	*
Willis, Melinda	Interviewer	4/24-5/31	*
Howard, Dr. Lawrence C.	Consultant	4/24	One day
Butler, Dr. Broadus N.	Consultant	4/30	One day

---

* Employed the equivalent of full-time for one month.

** Employed the equivalent of full-time for two and a half weeks.

9. Future activities planned for next reporting period

The final research report is due the end of December. In mid-October about 1000 follow-up questionnaires are being mailed to faculty members. In the next three or four weeks we hope to prepare a preliminary report of data analysis and conclusions which can be circulated for criticism and comment to selected consultants and to some of the administrators and project directors who served as interview subjects in the study. Depending on time available, Dr. Miller and Dr. Gurin will make follow-up visits to a few of the subject institutions and to some of their cooperating universities and agencies. This additional data, responses to the circulated preliminary draft, follow-up faculty questionnaire responses, and our continuing efforts to derive generalizations from the interview materials will be used to compile the final research report.

10. Certification

Signature of Contract Officer	Signature of Principal Investigator or Project Director
Date	Date

Progress Report
October 1968
Exhibit A

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS PROJECT

CAMPUSES VISITED - SPRING 1968

*Alabama A & M College (Ala.)
*Allen University (S. Car.)
Bellarmine College (Ky.)
*Benedict College (S. Car.)
*Jackson State College (Miss.)
*Knoxville College (Tenn.)
*Maryville College (Tenn.)
*Miles College (Ala.)
Millsaps College (Miss.)
*North Carolina A & T State University (N. Car.)
*North Carolina College at Durham (N. Car.)
*Shaw University (N. Car.)
Southern University and A & M College (La.)
St. Andrew's Presbyterian College (N. Car.)
*Tougaloo College (Miss.)
Ursuline College (Ky.)
*Wilberforce University (Ohio)

Atlanta University Center Corporation (Ga.)
*Clark College
*Morehouse College
*Morris Brown College
*Spelman College

Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education
Avila College (Mo.)
Baker University (Kans.)
*Kansas City Art Institute (Mo.)
*Missouri Valley College (Mo.)
*Mt. St. Scholastica College (Kans.)
Ottawa University (Kans.)
Rockhurst College (Mo.)
*St. Benedict's College (Kans.)
*St. Mary College (Kans.)
Tarkio College (Mo.)

Nebraska Educational Television Council for Higher Education
Chadron State College
College of St. Mary
Doane College
Midland Lutheran College
Nebraska Wesleyan University
Peru State College

---

* Faculty questionnaires distributed at these colleges.

Developing Institutions Project
611 Church Street
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104
Phone: 763-0231

People to Interview

President

Dean

Vice Presidents

Development Officer

Business Manager

Registrar

Dean of Students

Project III Coordinator(s)

Project Director(s)

Other staff members on Project III

Faculty involved in Title III

Faculty not directly involved (includes Chairmen and other faculty in departments with NTF's and Visiting Scholars)

NTF's, Visiting Scholars

Students

Involved in Title III:

- Experimental Programs
- Taught by NTF's
- Assistants in Program
- Exchange Students

Not Involved in Title III:

- Newspaper
- Activists
- Social types
- Scholars

DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS PROJECT

Interview for Administrators
(including Title III Program Heads)

PARTS A, C, D AND I ARE FOR ALL ADMINISTRATORS -- OTHERS ASKED WHERE APPLICABLE

A. Relation of Title III to Institutional Needs and Purposes

What institutional needs and purposes helped by Title III?
How has it strengthened the institution?
Personnel added and how they have helped
Experience, things you've learned
If Title III ended, could you keep any of these things going? Which? Ho ?
What Title III programs are less important?
Has Title III caused any problems?
What kinds of other things should Title III support?

B. Development Plans

What are the main ways you'd like to see your institution go, the main things you'd like to accomplish?
Plans for accomplishing these things
Problems in accomplishing them (PROBE for problems in addition to money)
Title III helpful in these plans?

C. Relations with ISE, Cooperating Institution, Other Outside Agencies

Describe the relationship
Attitude toward it
What your institution gets out of it
What other institution gets out of it
What are less successful aspects of it--any problems
If you were advising an institution that was planning to enter into such a relationship, what advice would you give?

D. Recent Changes in totla institution (Not just Title III)

Important changes in past 5 years
Who were major instigators
Was change influenced by Title III? By other outside funds?

E. Other Outside Support

Relationship of Title III to other grants--do they fit together into any overall plan?

F. Relationship with Office of Education

First contact -- How did it come about (who initiated)
Describe relations with OE
How has OE been helpful
Problems you've had
History of relations--getting better or worse

Ever try to change items in a contract? What items? What happened?
What kinds of changes would you like to see in relations with OE that would be helpful to institutions like yours?
For the coming fiscal year, how much did you request from Title III and how much did you get?
Where were you cut?
What effects will this have?

G. Specific Questions about Title III Program of Past Fiscal Year (1967-1968)-- mainly for Program Coordinators and Heads

Were you able to do everything you planned to do? (IF NO) Why not? What not done?
Any other problems?
What are some of the lessons you learned?
What would you do differently now?
Is there anything people in Washington could do to prevent problems like this?
Could you describe the general administrative mechanism to administer the program?
Any ways you feel it could be improved?
In general, how would you describe relationships with the administration in carrying out the program?
In what ways helpful?
In what ways problems?
Does program head have sole responsibility for running program or is it shared? Who with?
Problems of authority?
Have you had any problems staffing these programs? What problems?
How were people recruited for the program?
How do the new people, who came here as a result of Title III, get along with the others?
Any problems of any kind?
Relations with other faculty and administrators:
How much contact -- do they know what you're doing
Their reactions to the program
What effects do you feel the program has had on the institution?
Evaluation procedures -- formal and informal

H. Proposals for Title III Funds

Who was involved in the last Title III proposal (PROBE for involvement of people from other institution)
What kinds of problems are there in preparing proposals? How might these be helped?

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

I. Some general questions about the institution

1. How would you describe the relations of the institution with the community? Helpful aspects? Any problems or constraints?

2. On any campus there are usually some people who are "innovators" - trying new things, trying to get things done, trying to shake things up a little.

   If you had to name two or three people on campus like that, who would they be?

   What are they doing?
   How successful are they? What keeps them from being more successful?

3. Every institution - even the best - could be improved. What would you say are the main changes needed here?
   What are the things that keep these changes from happening?
   Who are the people most resistant to change?

4. Where would you say the greatest administrative strengths are in this institution?

5. Where would you say your greatest faculty strengths are?

6. How would you describe relations between faculty and administration?
   What kinds of problems in the relationship? How do they get resolved?

7. Who are the people with most influence among faculty and administration here? (People who've been here a long time or some of the newer people?)

8. Any differences between older and newer people in the institution?
   What? How resolved?

9. How would you describe relations between black and white faculty?
   Social or formal? Any problems, tensions?
   How would you describe relationship of students to white faculty?
   Any problems, tensions?

10. In general, how do you feel about the way decisions are made at this institution?
    Any ways this could be improved?
    How active are faculty in decisions?
    In your own job, are there any areas where you do not have all the decision-making power you should have?

11. How would you describe the students here at _____?
    Where do they come from?
    What are their strengths? Weaknesses?
    How would you describe relationships between students and faculty and administration?
    How active are students in decisions?
    Have there been any issues of student power here?
    (IF YES) When
    What
    How resolved
    R's attitude toward issue and resolution

12. What's your feeling about some of the student power issues they've had on other campuses?
    What causes the problem? How should it be handled?

13. Background data (Educational history; job history)

DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS PROJECT

Interview for Faculty

Department Chairmen (and other faculty) in departments with Visiting Scholars, NTF's, etc.

A. 1. Describe role and activities of Visiting Scholars, NTF's, in your department. (PROBE for special functions, replacement, help with overload, etc.)

2. Contact between visitors and other faculty
   - Social or professional
   - Any problems, difficulties, hostilities--
     - Why do you feel there are problems?
   - Relations between white and black staff
   - Between white staff and students?

3. Could you tell me a little about your courses?
   - Teaching methods
   - Any ways your teaching has changed in the past few years?
     - Why did you make these changes?

4. Have you talked much to visitors about teaching and teaching methods?
   - Have you gotten any ideas from them?

5. What do you feel the visitors have contributed to your department?
   - Factors helping and hindering their contributions
   - How could their contribution be improved?

6. Any (other) ways the visiting program has affected your own work?
   - Any ways it has helped?
   - Any ways it has made your work more difficult? (e.g., more work to do)

7. Have there been any important changes in your department in the past 4 or 5 years?
   - Syllabi and curricular changes
   - Changes in teaching methods
   - Have these changes in any way been influenced by the program for NTF's and Visiting Scholars?
   - Who (else) was influential in the changes?

B. If interviewee is director or on staff of any Title III program, ask the appropriate questions from Section G or H of Interview for Administrators.

C. Some General Questions about the Institution

1. On any campus there are usually some people who are "innovators"--trying new things, trying to get things done, trying to shake things up a little.

   If you had to name two or three people on campus like that, who would they be?
   - What are they doing?
   - How successful are they? What keeps them from being more successful?

2. Every institution--even the best--could be improved. What would you say are the main changes needed here?
   - What are the things that keep these changes from happening?
   - Who are the people most resistant to change?

3. Where would you say your greatest faculty strengths are in this institution?

4. Where would you use faculty strengthening?

5. How would you describe relations between faculty and administration?
   What kinds of problems in the relationship?
   How do they get resolved?

6. How active are faculty in decisions?

7. Who are the people with most influence among faculty and administration here? People who've been here a long time or some of the newer people?

8. Any divisions, different points of view within faculty or administration?
   What? How resolved?

9. Any differences between older and newer people in the institution? What?
   How resolved?

10. How would you describe relations between black and white faculty?
    Social or formal? Any problems, tensions?
    How would you describe relationship of students to white faculty?
    Any problems, tensions?

11. In general, how do you feel about the way decisions are made at this institution? Any ways this could be improved?

12. In your own job, how do you feel about the authority you have to do your job?

13. How would you describe the students here at _____?
    Where do they come from?
    What are their strengths? Weaknesses?
    How would you describe relationships between students and faculty and administration?
    How active are students in decisions?
    Have there been any issues of student power here?
    (IF YES) When
    What
    How resolved
    R's attitude toward issue and resolution

14. What's your feeling about some of the student power issues they've had on other campuses?
    What causes the problem?
    How should it be handled?

15. Relations with ISE, CEAP, cooperating institution
    How would you describe the relationship between your institution and _____?
    Probe for positives and negatives
    How outsiders who get along well differ from those who don't

16. Background data

DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS PROJECT

Interview for Students

A. Questions relevant to programs

1. Have you ever been an exchange student at another institution?
   (IF YES) What was it?
   How did you happen to go?
   Feelings about it--positives and negatives
   What did you get out of it? How are students affected by it? How are they different afterwards?
   What are the main differences between your institution and _____? Differences in faculty? In students?
   How did you find things academically?
   How did you find things socially?
   Were things different in any way from what you expected?
   How is that? Adjustment period?
   Did you get any orientation or preparation before you went?
   What kind? Any suggestions for improving orientation?
   Any suggestions for improving the exchange program?

   (IF NO) Probe for why R has not gone or considered going

2. Have you ever been in a class taught by someone from outside your institution--an NTF, a visiting professor, etc.?
   (IF YES) Reactions to the class--positives and negatives
   What are the differences between these teachers and the other ones you've had here?

3. (If involved in any other program or special experimental class)
   How got involved
   Reactions--positive and negative

4. Relations with ISE, CEAP, cooperating institutions
   Do you know that your institution has a relationship with _____?
   (IF YES) What have you heard about it?
   Feelings about it
   Any contact with people from the outside institution?
   What kind of contact? Reactions?

B. Some general questions

1. Feelings about the institution
   Education they've received
   Reactions to faculty
   Reactions to administration

2. On any campus there are usually some people who are "innovators"--trying new things, trying to get things done, trying to shake things up a little.

   If you had to name two or three people on campus like that, who would they be?
   What are they doing?
   How successful are they? What keeps them from being more successful?

3. Every institution--even the best--could be improved. What would you say are the main changes needed here?
   What are the things that keep these changes from happening?
   Who are the people most resistant to change?

4. How would you describe the students here at _____?
   Where do they come from"
   What are their strengths? Weaknesses?
   How would you describe relationships between students and faculty and administration?
   How active are students in decisions?
   Have there been any issues of student power here?
   (IF YES) When
   What
   How resolved
   R's attitude toward issue and resolution

5. What's your feeling about some of the student power issues they've had on other campuses?
   What causes the problem?
   How should it be handled?

6. Background data

Progress Report
October 1968
Exhibit B-5

DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS PROJECT

Interview for Visiting Scholars and NTF's

Role and activities at the institution
(PROBE for whether involved in special functions or classes, replaced a faculty member who went for further training, or just helping with overload.)

Contact with other faculty and people here--describe relations with others here
Social or professional
Any problems, difficulties, hostilities?
Why do you feel there are these problems?
How would you describe relations between white and black staff and white staff and black students?

Could you tell me a little about your courses?
Teaching methods
Any ways your teaching has changed since you first came here?
Why did you make these changes?
Does your teaching differ in any way from that of most others here?
Have you gotten ideas from other teachers?
Who?
What ideas?
Have you talked much to other teachers about your ideas?
Who?
What ideas?
What effects?
Does your teaching differ from teaching in the school you came from?
How?

What do you feel people like you may contribute to the institution?
How successful have you been?
Factors helping and hindering success
How could your contribution be improved?

What have you gotten out of the experience?
Have things been different in any way from what you expected them to be?
Any ways people like you might be better prepared and oriented for your stay here?

How would you describe the students here at _____?
What are their strengths? Weaknesses?
How do they differ from the students in the school you came from?
Implications of these differences for your teaching?
How would you describe relationships of the students to you and the other NTF's and visiting scholars?

Have there been any important changes since you first came here?
What changes--effect of changes?
People involved in changes--who initiated?
Probe for academic changes--curricular and syllabi, teaching methods, etc.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
ANN ARBOR
48104

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

1100 SOUTH UNIVERSITY
Tel. (313) 764-9472

Spring 1968

Dear Colleague:

The Center for the Study of Higher Education at The University of Michigan is doing a national study of the impact of Title III (developing institutions) programs upon a representative group of about 30 colleges and universities. Our purpose is not to evaluate individual situations, but rather to arrive at generalizations which can be useful to the institutions engaged in these programs. No individual persons or institutions will be identified in the report.

We are interviewing many of the faculty members and administrators who are directly involved with these programs on your campus. In addition, we are asking all members of the faculty and administration to fill out this questionnaire--including those who have had no contact with the Title III programs. In our pretests most people have needed only ten to fifteen minutes to complete this questionnaire.

We greatly appreciate your cooperation on this study. When you have completed this questionnaire, please seal it in the enclosed envelope and return it. Your answers will be completely confidential.

Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

James L. Miller Jr

James L. Miller, Jr.
Director

Progress Report
October 1968
Exhibit C

Representative of questionnaire distributed to faculty members on 21 campuses: pages 1, 8, and 9 were done separately for each campus to represent programs in operation on that campus.

St. Mary College

Most of the questions in the questionnaire refer to the following Title III Programs that are currently in operation on the campus.

A. Planning Grant for Self-Study

B. Faculty Development Programs

C. Distinguished Scholar Seminars and Lecturers

D. Other Programs related to KCRCHE

E. National Teaching Fellows

Questions 1 through 8 refer to these programs. The programs are identified by the letters A, B, C, D, and E.

1372

1. We'd like your opinions about each of the programs listed on page 1. Please check one box for each program to indicate whether you think it is addressed to the important needs of your institutions. Please use the following code in answering the question:

   1. Very important -- directed to the most important needs
   2. Important -- directed to important needs, but others are just as important
   3. Fairly important -- directed to important needs but others are more important
   4. Not important -- Not directed to important needs
   5. No opinion -- don't really know enough about this program

CHECK ONE BOX FOR EACH PROGRAM

PROGRAM (see page 1)	Very important	Important	Fairly important	Not important	No opinion
A	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
B	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
C	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
D	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
E	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

2. Now, we'd like you to indicate how helpful you feel the program has been.

   1. A very helpful program -- many positive effects, hard to imagine the college without it
   2. A helpful program -- a good program, with many contributions to the life of the college
   3. Neutral -- hardly know it's here; little or no impact on the college
   4. A negative program -- has caused more trouble than help
   5. No opinion -- don't know enough about this program

CHECK ONE BOX FOR EACH PROGRAM

PROGRAM	Very helpful	Helpful	Neutral	Negative	No opinion
A	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
B	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
C	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
D	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
E	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

3. We'd like to know the reasons for your feelings about the programs. For each of the programs listed on page 1, please indicate why you feel the program has been helpful or not helpful. That is, if for Program A you answered "very helpful" in the question above, write here some of the things about the program that you think make it especially helpful or a good program; if you answered "negative," write here some of the things that make you think it is not a helpful program.

PROGRAM — COMMENT -- WHY HELPFUL OR NOT HELPFUL

A _____

_____

_____

B _____

_____

_____

C _____

_____

_____

_____

D _____

_____

_____

E _____

_____

_____

4. What are some of the important needs of your institution that are not covered by the Title III Programs?

_____

_____

_____

_____

5. What kind of contact have you had with each program?

1. Actively involved -- I'm part of the program staff
2. I'm not part of the program staff, but I have some interaction with the program in my official administrative or faculty position
3. I have some informal contact with the program (informal consulting, exchange of ideas with those involved, etc.)
4. I have no contact with the program

CHECK ONE BOX FOR EACH PROGRAM

Program	Staff	Official contact	Informal contact	No contact
A	☐	☐	☐	☐
B	☐	☐	☐	☐
C	☐	☐	☐	☐
D	☐	☐	☐	☐
E	☐	☐	☐	☐

6. How much contact have you had with each program?

1. A great deal of contact
2. A fair amount of contact
3. A little contact
4. None, although I know what the program is doing
5. None, and I don't know anything about the program

CHECK ONE BOX FOR EACH PROGRAM

Program	Great deal	Fair amount	Little	None, but know program	None
A	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
B	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
C	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
D	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
E	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

7. What effect has each of these programs had on your own work?

CHECK ONE BOX FOR EACH PROGRAM

Program	Major	Some	A little	None
A	☐	☐	☐	☐
B	☐	☐	☐	☐
C	☐	☐	☐	☐
D	☐	☐	☐	☐
E	☐	☐	☐	☐

8. For each program with any effect on your own work (columns one, two, or three, above in Q. 7) please indicate what that effect has been. Examples might be that it changed the nature of your work, from teaching to administration; or that it improved the quality of your students; or changed some of your ideas about how to teach your course; or that it added to your work load; or many other possibilities. Please list as many as you can think of.

PROGRAM _____ COMMENT -- EFFECT ON MY OWN WORK _____

A _____

_____

_____

B _____

_____

_____

C _____

_____

_____

D _____

_____

_____

E _____

_____

_____

9. In the space below, please add any comments about the Title III Projects and their influence in your institution.

10. Now, some questions about yourself, so we can compare the views of faculty members and administrators with different backgrounds and experience:

Please list the institution granting each academic degree you hold and the year it was granted:

		Year
B.A. or B.S.	_____	_____
M.A. or M.S.	_____	_____
Ph.D.	_____	_____
Specialist	_____	_____
Ed.D.	_____	_____
Professional degree: (SPECIFY)	_____	_____
Other (SPECIFY)	_____	_____

Present rank:
- ☐ Administrator
- ☐ Professor
- ☐ Associate professor
- ☐ Assistant professor
- ☐ Instructor
- ☐ National Teaching Fellow
- ☐ Visiting Scholar
- ☐ Lecturer

Years of full-time teaching at this college:
- ☐ Less than 1 year
- ☐ 1-3 years
- ☐ 4-6 years
- ☐ 7-10 years
- ☐ 11-14 years
- ☐ 15-18 years
- ☐ 19-21 years
- ☐ 22-25 years
- ☐ More than 25 years

What was your average teaching load during the 1967-68 school year?
- ☐ 0 hours
- ☐ 1-5 hours
- ☐ 6-8 hours
- ☐ 9-11 hours
- ☐ 12-15 hours
- ☐ 16 hours or more

What is your race? _____

10. (continued)

What is your age? _____

Did you talk with one of our interviewers when our team was on your campus?

☐ Yes ☐ No

What is your teaching field or academic discipline?

☐ Humanities (English, philosophy, religion, languages)
☐ Social sciences (Political science, history, economics, psychology, sociology)
☐ Natural sciences and Mathematics (Biology, chemistry, physics, mathematics)
☐ Arts (Music, art, speech)
☐ Engineering
☐ Business
☐ Education
☐ Other (SPECIFY) _____

List any regional or national professional meetings you have attended in the past year--include professional associations, institutes, workshops, etc.

_____

_____

_____

11. Now, we'd like you to rate Title III Programs and other sponsored programs on your campus in order of their importance to the work of the college. If there were a sudden emergency which made it necessary to discontinue all but two or three of these programs, which ones do you think should be continued? Which ones are less critical, even though very helpful? Rank the program by placing a "1" beside the most important program, "2" beside the second most important program, "3" beside the third most important, etc., until you have numbered all of the programs on the list.

Ranking	Programs
___	Planning grant for self-study
___	Faculty development programs
___	Distinguished Scholar Seminars and Lecturers
___	Other programs related to KCRCHE
___	National Teaching Fellows
___	Library grant (Higher Education Act)
___	Equipment grant (Higher Education Act)
___	National Defense Student Loan funds
___	College work-study program
___	Economic opportunity grants
___	Other (PLEASE LIST ADDITIONAL PROGRAMS YOU FEEL ARE PARTICULARLY IMPORTANT TO THE COLLEGE.)

PLEASE COMMENT:

What makes the programs rated "1" and "2" the most important?

_____

_____

_____

_____

Why did you rate the last two programs at the bottom of your list of priorities?

_____

_____

_____

_____

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
ANN ARBOR
48104

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

1100 SOUTH UNIVERSITY
Tel. (313) 764-9472

October 1968

Dear Colleague:

You may recall we sent you a questionnaire last spring for a study being conducted by the Center for the Study of Higher Education at The University of Michigan. This is a national study of the impact of Title III (developing institutions) programs upon a representative group of about 30 colleges and universities. Our purpose is not to evaluate individual situations, but rather to arrive at generalizations which can be useful to the institutions engaged in these programs. No individual persons or institutions will be identified in the report.

This questionnaire was sent to members of the faculty and administration in these institutions - including the ones who had no contact with the Title III programs. We have prepared a much shorter version of the questionnaire and are sending it to the people who did not return the first questionnaire. It contains some minimal information that is important for the study to obtain on a complete sample of the faculty and administration. It will take only five to ten minutes to complete the questionnaire.

According to our records, we have not received the questionnaire sent to you last spring and are sending you a copy of this second questionnaire. We would greatly appreciate your cooperation on this study even if you feel you have no knowledge of the Title III programs. The questions provide an opportunity for you to check "no opinion."

When you have completed this questionnaire, please seal it in the enclosed stamped envelope and return it. Your answers will be completely confidential. The number on the questionnaire is only for our record purposes.

Yours sincerely,

James L Miller Jr

James L. Miller, Jr., Director

JLM/mar
Enc

Progress Report
October 1968
Exhibit D

Representative of questionnaire distributed to faculty members on 21 campuses; pages 1 and 6 were done separately for each campus to represent programs in operation on that campus.

Knoxville College

Most of the questions in the questionnaire refer to the following Title III Programs that were in operation on the campus last year.

A. CEAP - intensive Program for entering students

B. Faculty development program

C. Oak Ridge Teachers program

D. U.T. Closed circuit TV project

E. National Teaching Fellows

Questions 1 through 4 refer to these programs. The programs are identified by the letters A, B, C, D, and E.

1. We'd like your opinions about each of the programs listed on page 1. Please check one box for each program to indicate whether you think it is addressed to the important needs of your institution. Please use the following code in answering the question:

    1. Very important -- directed to the most important needs
    2. Important -- directed to important needs, but others are just as important
    3. Fairly important -- directed to important needs, but others are more important
    4. Not important -- not directed to important needs
    5. No opinion -- don't really know enough about this program

CHECK ONE BOX FOR EACH PROGRAM

PROGRAM (see page 1)	Very important	Important	Fairly important	Not important	No opinion
A	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
B	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
C	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
D	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
E	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

2. Now, we'd like you to indicate how helpful you feel the program has been.

    1. A very helpful program -- many positive effects, hard to imagine the college without it
    2. A helpful program -- a good program, with many contributions to the life of the college
    3. Neutral -- hardly know it's here; little or no impact on the college
    4. A negative opinion -- has caused more trouble than help
    5. No opinion -- don't know enough about this program

CHECK ONE BOX FOR EACH PROGRAM

PROGRAM	Very helpful	Helpful	Neutral	Negative	No opinion
A	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
B	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
C	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
D	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
E	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

3. What kind of contact did you have with each program last year?

1. Actively involved -- I was part of the program staff
2. I was not part of the program staff, but I had some interaction with the program in my official administrative or faculty position
3. I had some informal contact with the program (informal consulting, exchange of ideas with those involved, etc.)
4. I had no contact with the program

CHECK ONE BOX FOR EACH PROGRAM

PROGRAM	Staff	Official contact	Informal contact	No contact
A	☐	☐	☐	☐
B	☐	☐	☐	☐
C	☐	☐	☐	☐
D	☐	☐	☐	☐
E	☐	☐	☐	☐

4. How much contact did you have with each program?

1. A great deal of contact
2. A fair amount of contact
3. A little contact
4. None, although I know what the program was doing
5. None, and I don't know anything about the program

CHECK ONE BOX FOR EACH PROGRAM

PROGRAM	Great deal	Fair amount	Little	None, but know program	None
A	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
B	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
C	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
D	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
E	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

5. Now, some questions about yourself, so we can compare the views of faculty members and administrators with different backgrounds and experience:

Please list the institution granting each academic degree you hold and the year it was granted:

		Year
B.A. or B.S.	_____	_____
M.A. or M.S.	_____	_____
Ph.D.	_____	_____
Specialist	_____	_____
Ed.D.	_____	_____
Professional degree: (SPECIFY)	_____	_____
Other (SPECIFY)	_____	_____

Present rank:
- ☐ Administrator
- ☐ Professor
- ☐ Associate professor
- ☐ Assistant professor
- ☐ Instructor
- ☐ National Teaching Fellow
- ☐ Visiting Scholar
- ☐ Lecturer

Years of full-time teaching at this college:
- ☐ Less than 1 year
- ☐ 1-3 years
- ☐ 4-6 years
- ☐ 7-10 years
- ☐ 11-14 years
- ☐ 15-18 years
- ☐ 19-21 years
- ☐ 22-25 years
- ☐ More than 25 years

What was your average teaching load during the 1967-68 school year?
- ☐ 0 hours
- ☐ 1-5 hours
- ☐ 6-8 hours
- ☐ 9-11 hours
- ☐ 12-15 hours
- ☐ 16 hours or more

What is your race? _____

What is your age? _____

Did you talk with one of our interviewers when our team was on campus?

☐ Yes ☐ No

What is your teaching field or academic discipline?

☐ Humanities (English, philosophy, religion, languages)
☐ Social sciences (Political science, history, economics, psychology, sociology
☐ Natural sciences and Mathematics (Biology, chemistry, physics, mathematics)
☐ Arts (Music, art, speech)
☐ Engineering
☐ Business
☐ Education
☐ Other (SPECIFY) _____

List any regional or national professional meetings you have attended in the past year--include professional associations, institutes, workshops, etc.

_____

_____

_____

6. Now, we'd like you to rate Title III Programs on your campus in order of their importance to the work of the college. If there were a sudden emergency which made it necessary to discontinue all but one of these programs, which ones do you think should be continued? Which ones are less critical, even though very helpful? Rank the program by placing a "1" beside the most important program, "2" beside the second most important, "3" beside the third most important, etc., until you have numbered all of the programs on the list.

Ranking	Program
____	CEAP - intensive program for entering students
____	Faculty development program
____	Oak Ridge Teachers program
____	U.T. Closed circuit TV project
____	National Teaching Fellows

7. As you know, the University of Tennessee has had a cooperating relationship with Knoxville College. All in all, how do you feel about the way the relationship has worked out?

- ☐ Very satisfied
- ☐ Fairly satisfied
- ☐ Satisfied in some ways, dissatisfied in others
- ☐ Fairly dissatisfied
- ☐ Very dissatisfied
- ☐ No opinion -- don't know anything about it

Progress Report
October 1968
Exhibit E

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
ANN ARBOR
48104

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

1100 SOUTH UNIVERSITY
Tel. (313) 764-9472

Memo to: Advisory Council on Developing Institutions

From: James L. Miller, Jr., Project Director

Date: October 22, 1968

On March 1, 1968, the Center for the Study of Higher Education at The University of Michigan undertook a ten-month study of the "Use and Effectiveness of Title III in Selected 'Developing Institutions.'" The study was funded by the Bureau of Research, USOE, and has had the active support of the Division of Institutional Support, Bureau of Higher Education, USOE, which administers the Title III - Developing Institutions program. In response to a request from the Division of Institutional Support, I am happy to present to the annual meeting of the Advisory Council on Developing Institutions an interim report on the progress of our study.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to observe the effects which programs funded under Title III - Developing Institutions have had in a selected group of colleges and universities in order to make general judgments with as much precision as possible concerning factors associated with program success. The initial assumptions are that in any program such as this, there will be greater success in some situations than in others.

When a Federal program is new, it is necessary to rely exclusively upon informed judgments concerning types of situations that are promising; after several years of experience, it is possible to augment these judgments with an analysis of the degrees of success and failure which previously funded activities have experienced. The present study was undertaken to give such an analysis. Its practical usefulness lies in the assistance it may provide when future judgments are made about funding various types of projects.

In the final report we plan to comment upon the relative impact which various types of programs have had in various types of institutional settings and the factors which seem to have accounted for their successes and failures. We have attempted to structure the study so that as many as possible of the potential variables can be identified and considered. Among the more obvious possibilities are institutional quality, type of program chosen, quality of personnel in the institution totally and in the program itself, compatibility between the particular program and the institution in which it is undertaken, the availability of relevant extra-institutional assistance, and the receptiveness within the institution to innovation in general, as well as to the particular type of innovation undertaken.

An important qualification in assessing each of these factors is that the Developing Institutions program is by definition a "risk" venture in that its basic purpose is to assist institutions which have identifiable problems--institutions which are in some respect outside the mainstream of American higher education. Like the physician who could improve his record by accepting only patients with minor illnesses, the Developing Institutions program is faced with the necessity of weighing its "success

record" against its mandated mission. It would be remiss it if failed to accept some poor risk situations, but it also would be remiss if it did not give attention to monitoring its degree of impact.

It is appropriate to mention facts concerning what the present study is not. It is not an "evaluation" of the Title III program as such, nor is it an evaluation of any of the institutions which were chosen for inclusion in the study. Although the study might lead us to the general conclusion that the total Title III program is a failure (in which case we would feel constrained to so report), the initial presumption is that governmental assistance to developing institutions is a good idea and that the first two years of the program probably result in a spectrum of some outstanding successes, some failures, and many outcomes in between. Our task is not simply to ascertain that this has indeed been the fact, but to identify as precisely as possible the factors associated with success or failure so that in the future the successes might be increased and the failures reduced. Probably partly this involves factors related to the selection of projects for funding, and partly the manner in which projects are organized and administered. Given the basic mission of the Federal Developing Institutions program, it is as important to identify and inform institutions of things they can do to make projects more successful as it is to inform the Federal agency of ways they might identify projects most likely to succeed or fail.

Study Project Activities to Date

The first seven months have been devoted to data collection, organization of materials, and analysis.

Between March 1 and June 15 we identified and trained twenty-one interviewers who then visited thirty-seven developing institutions in the South and Midwest, interviewing administrators, faculty, and students. Interviewers typically traveled in teams of four to six and spent two or three days at a single institution. A list of the institutions visited is attached. Interviewers sought information about the institution and the Title III programs at the institution; i.e., they sought information about both the programs and the setting in which they were being carried on. The schedule was unusually tight because of the rapidly approaching close of the academic year. Within a period of five weeks, a total of 219 interviewing days were spent talking with about 250 college administrators and staff members, 175 faculty members, 50 National Teaching Fellows, and 65 students or student groups. In addition, interviewers collected printed materials and factual data from each campus, and conferred with staff members in central coordinating offices and at cooperating institutions. Detailed notes prepared by the interviewers following their campus visits total more than 2400 pages of typescript.

In addition to interviews and printed materials, a brief opinion questionnaire was distributed to faculty members on twenty-one of the thirty-seven campuses visited. Interviewers made arrangements for distribution of the questionnaire while they were on campus; responses were sent directly to the Institute for Social Research at The University of Michigan. An abbreviated follow-up questionnaire is being distributed in October to faculty members who did not respond to the spring questionnaire.

The summer was spent organizing the interview data, coding the faculty questionnaires, and compiling brief case reports on selected institutions and types of programs. The multiple approach to information and opinion gathering through the use of a literature review, interviews, and questionnaires provides us with a wealth of information which is susceptible to analysis in a variety of ways. During the fall the staff has met regularly to begin the process of integrating this large body of material and to discuss details and implications of the data. The preparation of some sections of the final report is underway.

Sections of the final report will be available in draft form within the next month or so and will be distributed for comments and criticism to a number of selected individuals. The final report will be available on or about December 31, 1968.

Issues for Possible Advisory Council Consideration

Although the study is still underway and no firm conclusions or findings can be definitely reported as yet, certain issues which have become apparent are noted here because they seem especially relevant to concerns of the Advisory Council. The Council may want to take them under consideration at this time rather than waiting for the study's final report.

1. Should Inter-institutional Cooperation Be a Required Part of Every Proposal?

At the present time some form of inter-institutional cooperation is required as part of each proposal. In many situations inter-institutional cooperation has been helpful--sometimes extremely helpful--to

the institutions involved. In other cases, however, it has been nothing but window-dressing. The latter cases divide into two groups: those in which the institutions might have benefited from effective inter-institutional cooperation but were unable or unwilling to effectuate it, and those in which the type of program undertaken (or the institutional situation) made cooperation unnecessary or irrelevant. We observed some situations in which the program funded by Title III was having a positive and constructive impact upon the institution even though there was no genuine inter-institutional cooperation involved. Since the central purpose of the Title III - Developing Institutions program is institutional improvement, we conclude that the program would be wise to fund many types of programs which offer promise of achieving this goal without procedural restrictions such as the present requirement that programs be organized within a framework of inter-institutional cooperation. Inter-institutional cooperation has proved to be a valuable device in a number of situations, but this does not mean that it should be mandatory in all situations.

2. Administrative Arrangements for Dealing Directly with Consortia Offices or Agencies

Some inter-institutional consortia have chosen to establish and staff a central office (or to utilize an existing one) through which consortia programs funded under Title III are coordinated and in some cases administered. The particular arrangements differ in each situation as to the degree of responsibility and control which actually is vested in the central staff, but in each case the original proposals, the progress reports, and/or the proposals for the continuation of funding specifically point to the existence of these offices and suggest that they constitute evidence of effective inter-institutional cooperation

and a vehicle for the implementation of the cooperative program. In some instances we found evidence that tensions and conflicts between personnel in these offices and personnel in the institutions had gone far beyond the point of "normal inter-personal frictions" and had reached the point at which consortia office personnel were being denied access to documents, reports, and records related to the programs which they supposedly coordinate.

Obviously, these situations are difficult and unpleasant to deal with. Reluctance of the Washington staff to become involved is understandable. It does appear, however, that attention should be given to this matter in one way or another because these conflicts affect (actually or potentially) the effectiveness of the Federal funded programs. The Federal response might take any of several forms. One would be to deal directly with consortia staff, either by seeking a change in the wording of the legislation to explicitly permit this, or by an administrative determination that in at least some cases the institutional application itself makes the importance of the consortia office so obvious as to indicate that the Washington staff cannot deal with the funded activity unless its dealings include the consortia staff. An alternative way of dealing with the conflict situations would be to continue to deal with the institutions as the formal contracting agencies, but to hold the institutions responsible for breakdowns in relationships with the consortia offices. The third alternative, that of ignoring the situation, avoids trouble in the short run but opens the possibility of more serious long-run trouble.

3. Problems with the Date of Notification

The most frequently mentioned problem at all institutions was the lateness of the date of notification of approval of the grant. At most institutions specific mention was made of the fact that the date of notification was a particular problem in the first year of the program when it came extremely late and in some cases made it impossible to carry out the intended program in a satisfactory manner. In subsequent years the notification date has been in the spring and has been much more satisfactory. But it still constitutes a problem for those types of programs which are especially dependent upon the identification and employment of special staff. The normal college and university staff recruiting season comes in the late fall and winter for positions which will be effective in the following summer or fall. A grant notification date in the spring has the undesirable consequence of forcing institutions to recruit late for personnel (which is apt to mean that the best prospects are no longer available) or to "gamble" institutional funds by entering into contracts with personnel on the assumption that the grant will be approved (something which "developing" institutions are less able to do than other institutions). Consideration should be given to the possibility of moving the grant notification date even earlier if at all possible.

4. Need for Consultative Assistance on Title III Programs

As we visited institutions, we were impressed with their desire to receive a greater amount of assistance from the administrative staff of the Title III program and/or from consultants who could work with institutions in the preparation of proposals and the improvement of

administration within existing programs. Frankly, this came as somewhat of a surprise to us, given the general presumption that recipients of Federal assistance like to be given the money and then left alone. It was apparent that institutions were interested in learning how other institutions were handling administrative problems growing out of the Title III programs. The fairly simple forms of information-sharing which occur when the Washington staff visits institutions, when institutional administrators visit the Washington offices, and when institutional administrators of Title III programs gather together are of greatest assistance to the less sophisticated institutions which are a major client-group in the Title III program.

We would suggest that the administrative staff of the Title III program undertake more institutional visitation than has been done heretofore. We recognize that travel has been limited because of Federal travel "freezes" and the limited size of the Title III staff, but we consider these false economies. The programs in many institutions would be significantly improved by a modest amount of assistance of a type which the Title III administrative staff is well qualified to give.

5. Program Priorities

The establishment of priorities among programs will receive extended attention in the final report. Presently the greatest emphasis is upon curricular improvement and faculty improvement. This is appropriate. The range of programs falling under these headings is great, and some are more effective than others. Administrative improvement programs are clearly one of the important areas deserving of special emphasis. Reference to this was made by institutional administrators during many of our campus visits. Administrative improvement is important because

it affects the viability of other programs and activities within the institution. The National Teaching Fellows have been used in a great variety of ways by individual institutions and some uses are much more related to long-range institutional improvement than others. Policies concerning National Teaching Fellows probably should be framed in terms of the way in which the NTF's will be used and the relation to long-range institutional improvement which the proposed use suggests, rather than considering NTF's as a type of "program" which has much similarity from one institution to the next.

Conclusion

In the pages above we have attempted to indicate our progress to date and the types of questions which seem particularly relevant to the interests of the Advisory Council. We invite comments, suggestions, and criticisms as we prepare the final report of our study.